

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define one or more aspects of the invention. In the invention, it is clear that the first and the second types of auditory feedback are different from each other. In Claim 1, an additional claim limitation has been added to cover embodiments where the first and the second types (in addition to being different) are each one of the following: a voiced output, audible click or a playing of an audio file. Support for the amendments to Claim 1 may be found on page 4, 1.10, page 4, 1.13, page 5, 1.18-19 and page 9, 1.17-18 of the specification as filed. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1-9, 11, 15-19, 21, 23, 24 and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi in view of Kowalski, Itoh and Nuovo.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 10, 20 and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi, Kowalski, Itoh and Nuovo and further in view of Macor and Schwelb.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 12 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi, Kowalski, Itoh and Nuovo and further in view of Lemaire.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 14 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi, Kowalski, Itoh and Nuovo and further in view of Argyroudis.

Ohashi discloses scrolling and displaying in turn the data storage locations when scrolled through. When a data storage location is navigated through, an audio tag is conditionally played: an audio tag is played out only for data storage locations that link to an audio storage location. Ohashi neither discloses nor suggests playing an audio file or a sound when scrolling through the data storage locations that do not link to audio storage locations. Ohashi only discloses providing a feedback output for some, not all, data storage locations that the user can scrolled through.

Thus, contrary to what the Examiner argues, Ohashi neither discloses nor suggests a feedback output providing a first type of auditory feedback information about each respective selectable one of the options.

Ohashi also does not disclose providing a first type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a first speed and providing a second different type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a second different speed as claimed in Claims 1 and 15.

Moreover, Ohashi does not disclose the first and second types being one of a voiced feedback output, audible click or playing of audio file as claimed in Claim 15.

Kowalski discloses a voice synthesizer that is enabled to voice the location number of location name indicated by the location counter, such as, for example, "ONE" or "HOME" when scrolling through memory locations. However, Kowalski does not disclose scrolling through the memory locations at a first speed and at a second different speed thus Kowalski neither discloses nor suggests the claim limitation of providing a first type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a first speed and providing a second different type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a second different speed and the first and second types being one of a voiced feedback output, audible click or playing of audio file.

Itoh discloses outputting a voice waveform data indicating a voice waveform of a normal speed. In a fast feed mode, Itoh enables outputting a voice waveform data at a speed which is faster than the normal speed. Itoh discloses providing voice waveforms in both modes. The two voice waveforms, though different, are of the same type of auditory feedback whereas the invention teaches providing two different types of auditory feedback for navigating at different speeds. Applicants respectfully submit that Itoh discloses two different auditory feedback information at two different speeds however these two auditory feedback information are of the same type. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Itoh teaches a device that has the capability of providing two types of feedback to a user when outputting audible information. Indeed, both voice waveforms are of a voiced output type as the term "type" is defined in the specification as filed or as claimed in Claim 1 and are therefore not different as claimed in Claim 1 and 15.

Thus, Itoh neither discloses nor suggests providing a first type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a first speed and providing a second different type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a second different speed.

Itoh also neither teaches nor discloses the first and the second types being different and each being one of a voiced feedback output, audible click or playing of audio file.

Nuovo discloses a navigation key for a handset that allows a user to navigate/scroll at different speeds. However Nuovo neither discloses nor suggests providing two types of auditory feedback when the user scrolls at different speeds using the navigation key.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that neither Ohashi, Itoh, Kowalski nor Nuovo discloses, explicitly or impliedly, the claim limitation of a feedback output providing a first type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a first speed and providing a second different type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a second different speed as claimed in Claims 1 and 15. It is also respectfully submitted that neither Ohashi, Itoh, Kowalski nor Nuovo discloses, explicitly or impliedly the first and second types being different and each being one of a voiced feedback output, audible click or a playing of audio file.

In addition, even if their teachings were to be combined the result would still not disclose, explicitly or impliedly, the claim limitation of a feedback output providing a first type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a first speed and providing a second different type of auditory feedback when the user navigates at a second different speed.

The rejection of independent Claims 1 and 15 under 35 USC 103 is therefore incorrect and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Ohashi in view of Kowalski, Itoh and Nuovo. It is also respectfully submitted that the dependent Claims are patentable over Ohashi in view of Kowalski, Itoh and Nuovo of at least based on their dependencies.


Applicants respectfully submit that they have answered all issues raised by the Examiner and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Such allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270.

Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 12, 2002

By   
Gwenaëlle Le Pennec  
Limited Recognition under 37 C.F.R. 10.9(b)  
(408) 617-4837

## APPENDIX A

Version with Markings  
to Show Changes Made to the Claims

The following is marked up version of amended Claim 1:

- 1.(AMENDED FOUR TIMES)      An information processing device comprising a user-interface for enabling a user to interact with the device, the device comprising:
- a navigating input for enabling the user to navigate in a set of options;]
  - a memory enabling the user to store an audio file representative of a specific one of the options;]
  - a feedback output to provide a first type of auditory feedback information to the user about each respective selectable one of the options, the first type of auditory feedback [comprising a play out of the audio file when the user is navigating at a first speed], and to provide a second different type of auditory feedback information to the user about each respective selectable one of the options when the user is navigating at a second different speed, the first and the second types of auditory feedback each being one of a voice output, audible clicks or playing of portion of an audio file;
  - a validating input to enable the user to select the current option based on the provided feedback information.